

### **REMARKS**

Claims 61-66 are pending in this application. Claim 61 is independent. In light of the remarks contained herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding Official Action.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 61-65 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kusanagi (USP 6,670,966, WO00/28543); and rejected claim 66 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kusanagi in view of Morris (USP 5,862,372).

#### **Statement of the Substance of Interview**

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner and his Supervisor for the courtesies extended during the Interview conducted on December 9, 2009. During the Interview, the parties discussed the claimed invention. The parties further discussed the teachings of Kusanagi. Applicants respectfully submit that the arguments as presented herein conform substantially to the matters discussed during the Interview.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102**

In their previous response, Applicants presented arguments that the teachings of Kusanagi were insufficient to teach or suggest all of the claim elements. Specifically, Applicants presented arguments that the Kusanagi failed to teach or suggest all of the claim elements, including “said multimedia contents data is processed so that predetermined media data is reproduced in said reproducing unit of said data processing device at a predetermined time on the basis of said schedule describing unit, a predetermined input operation is received by said inputting unit of said data processing device at said predetermined time, and said data processing device carries out a process that corresponds to said predetermined input operation at said predetermined time on the basis of said input operation describing unit.”

Specifically, Applicants argued that Kusanagi failed to teach or suggest receiving an input operation at the same predetermined time that predetermined media data is reproduced on the basis of the schedule describing unit. In response, the Examiner asserted Kusanagi discloses

that the clips can be edited after the recording of the media data. Once the media data is recorded, and then replayed (reproduced), the user can edit the data on a timeline. Since the clips are edited and run on a timeline, the clips are replayed on a schedule.

Applicants respectfully disagree that Kusanagi discloses this element. Kusanagi merely discloses that the user can edit the video with respect to a timeline. There is no disclosure that is directed to playing the media data at the same predetermined time that an input operation is received. Applicants maintain that merely editing a video, wherein the editing operations are not performed at a predetermined time based on a schedule, and while the video is not being reproduced is insufficient to teach or suggest reproducing the predetermined media data at a predetermined time and receiving a predetermined input operation at that same predetermined time, as required by the claim.

For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that Kusanagi fails to teach or suggest all of the claim elements. Applicants respectfully request the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 62-66 are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 61 at least based on their dependency on claim 61.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the above remarks, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Catherine M. Voisinet Reg. No. 52,327 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Application No. 10/532,936  
Amendment dated December 23, 2009  
After Final Office Action of October 28, 2009

Docket No.: 0033-0996PUS1

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: December 23, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Catherine M. Voisinet

Registration No.: 52,324

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicants